

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed, 04/27/2005, the Examiner objected to claim 25;

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly

being anticipated by Robinson et al;

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over Robinson et al. in view of Musk et al., US 6,148,260;

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 5-6, 11, 13-15, 18-19 and 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson et al. in view of Moran et al., US

6,326,946 and Thompson et al., US 5,986,401; and

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson et al. in view of Moran et al., US 6,326,946 and Thompson et al., US 5,986,401 and further in view of Musk et al., US 6,148,260.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection, and the §102 and §103 rejections, with the following arguments.

Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 25, alleging: "Claim 25 depends on claim 24. Claim 25 has the same exact limitation as claim 24 and thus does not further limit the claimed invention"

In light of the amendment of claim 25 herein, Applicants respectfully contend that the objection to claim 25 is moot.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Robinson et al.

Applicants respectfully contend that Robinson does not anticipate claim 1, because Robinson does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, cs not teach the feature: "said electronic document not being derived from the physical document".

Applicants note that Robinson stores an electronic image of the physical document in a registry (see Robinson, Section 3, first two sentences). Therefore, Robinson does not teach that the electronic document is not derived from the physical document.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Robinson does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-4 and 8 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2-4 and 8 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson et al. in view of Musk et al., US 6,148,260.

Since claims 7 and 9-10 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be anticipated by Robinson under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants maintain that claims 7 and 9-10 are not unpatentable over Robinson in view of Musk under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 5-6, 11, 13-15, 18-19 and 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson et al. in view of Moran et al., US 6,326,946 and Thompson et al., US 5,986,401.

Since claims 11, 13-15, and 26-30 have been canceled, Applicants respectfully contend that the rejection of claims 11, 13-15, and 26-30 is moot.

Since claims 5-6 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be anticipated by Robinson under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants maintain that claims 5-6 are not unpatentable over Robinson in view of Moran and Thompson under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 18 is not unpatentable over Robinson in view of Moran and Thompson, because Robinson in view of Moran and Thompson does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 18. For example, Robinson in view of Moran and Thompson does not teach or suggest the feature: "said electronic document not being derived from the physical document".

Applicants note that Robinson stores an electronic image of the physical document in a registry (see Robinson, Section 3, first two sentences). Therefore, Robinson does not teach or

suggest that the electronic document is not derived from the physical document.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 18 is not unpatentable over Robinson in view of Moran and Thompson, and that claim 18 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 19-25 depend from claim 18, Applicants contend that claims 19-25 are likewise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson et al. in view of Moran et al., US 6,326,946 and Thompson et al., US 5,986,401 and further in view of Musk et al., US 6,148,260.

Since claims 12 and 16-17 have been canceled, Applicants respectfully contend that the rejection of claims 12 and 16-17 is moot.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 07/18/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeisser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

09/892,399

15